

Date: Thu, 6 Oct 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #478  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 6 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 478

Today's Topics:

        Even more interesting (was Re: Interes  
                Get Over It  
        Glass houses and those who live in them  
        Suggestions for rev'd band plan?? (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 30 Sep 1994 20:38:21 GMT  
From: suggs@tcville.es.hac.com (Brian Suggs)  
Subject: Even more interesting (was Re: Interes

In article 7ki@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com, mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)  
writes:

>In <36brj3\$pbk@hacgate2.hac.com> suggs@tcville.es.hac.com (Brian Suggs) writes:  
>

>>If the ARS is the only service pushing Morse code, then the  
>>requirement for learning the code to support maintaining a  
>>pool of trained radio operators leads to a circular argument:  
>>

>>"Why do we require amateurs to learn Morse code?"

>>"Because the pool of trained operators in the ARS knows it."

>>"Why do so many amateurs know Morse code?"

>>"Because we require them to learn it."

>>etc.

>>

>Why this sudden focus on the "pool of trained operators" re CV? Obviously,

>there is less and less commercial CW work.

Because the "pool of trained operators" argument was one of the major arguments put forth by those supporting Morse code testing.

> Part 97.1 has many subparts, not  
>just the "pool of trained operators". Didn't we just spend a month  
>or so discussing \*other\* benefits of CW, such as simplicity of design and  
...

IMO, this line of reasoning (assuming one agrees with it, which I don't completely,) supports the USE of Morse code, not the testing requirement.

> Unlike  
>every other radio service, our goals and methods are \*not\* ruled by the bottom  
>line, so we have to be careful when we employ the "they're doing it, so we  
>should also" argument.

For the "trained operators" argument, the value of requiring amateurs to learn Morse code is significantly less if no one else is using it, and I don't see any other goals in part 97.1 which would support Morse code \*testing\*.

-Brian

-----  
Date: 3 Oct 1994 16:20:58 GMT  
From: suggs@tcville.es.hac.com (Brian Suggs)  
Subject: Get Over It

In article k47@chnews.intel.com, jlbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>In article <36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.neosoft.com>,  
>Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:  
>  
>>Hummmm....I've worked CW transcontinental on VHF and above...via OSCAR 11.  
>  
>Hmmmmmm.....without a license?

To be completely fair, he never actually said he didn't have a license.  
What he said was:

In a previous article, Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:  
>Non-amateurs are not listed in the callbook. I thought you already knew that.

Now I wouldn't blame you for inferring that he was not licensed, but that's not what he said.

-Brian  
KE6KQY/AE :-)

-----  
Date: Tue, 4 Oct 94 09:53:05 -0500  
From: brunelli\_pc@delphi.com  
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

<William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rock writes:

>>QRP'ers, being largely rockbound, can't move. If the digital stuff hops  
>  
>and why does running low power == crystal operation? when i was a novice, i  
>was running about 70-75 W input or so (around 30-35 W out, i think) so I  
>wasn't QRP but i was definitely fixed frequency...

I would like to know how this reply to some other message got in  
here, this is one of the problems in this group, any posting gets  
used as a soapbox for any reason.

-----  
Date: Tue, 4 Oct 94 09:57:12 -0500  
From: brunelli\_pc@delphi.com  
Subject: Suggestions for rev'd band plan??

For the third time now.....

If anyone has the will to think rather than react, how about some  
ideas on what modifications to the current band plan agreements  
would help to reduce "tensions" and conflicts between modes.

This is not flame bait. If the current plan is not working,  
take the opportunity of sunspot minima and escalating digital  
operations and mark up a copy of the current band plan.

thanks,  
pete n1qdd

-----  
Date: Tue, 4 Oct 1994 16:46:37 GMT  
From: wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX)  
Subject: Suggestions for rev'd band plan??

In article <pK7Ux+A.brunelli\_pc@delphi.com> brunelli\_pc@delphi.com writes:

>For the third time now.....

>

>If anyone has the will to think rather than react, how about some  
>ideas on what modifications to the current band plan agreements  
>would help to reduce "tensions" and conflicts between modes.

>

>take the opportunity of sunspot minima and escalating digital  
>operations and mark up a copy of the current band plan.

>

>thanks,

Pete, (not the Packeteer Pete from Pittsburgh, I'm sure)

What do you mean by "take opportunity of sunspot minima"? Would  
the band plan be only good for 5 years then expire in sunspot maxima?  
Are you reviewing all of the spectrum, or just HF?

If you can't get a new band plan off of the ground, maybe you need  
to float a trial balloon of a plan, and start the discussion from there.  
Also, the VE's here could give us the Canadian perspective. One  
should take care not to interfere with our true north neighbors.

Hmmm, on second thought, why bother? The F.C.C. has pampered them  
long enough. Lets dump the phone band exclusions and the north border 70 cm  
exclusions. We need the operating space. Let Darwinian forces dominate. If  
they can hold it, they can have it.

73,

C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4A0X

wyn@ornl.gov

=====

= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =

=====

-----

Date: Wed, 5 Oct 94 07:54:47 -0500

From: brunelli\_pc@delphi.com

Subject: Suggestions for rev'd band plan??

C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4A0X <wyn@ornl.gov> writes:

> What do you mean by "take opportunity of sunspot minima"? Would  
>the band plan be only good for 5 years then expire in sunspot maxima?  
>Are you reviewing all of the spectrum, or just HF?

The sunspot minima comment was directed to the idea that band plan alterations may be more acceptable during periods of poor propagation. That is MAY....

> If you can't get a new band plan off of the ground, maybe you need  
>to float a trial balloon of a plan, and start the discussion from there.  
>Also, the VE's here could give us the Canadian perspective. One  
>should take care not to interfere with our true north neighbors.

A very good point, and a trial balloon is just what i intended, i do not think that we would be installing a band plan from this group, just airing some possible alterations. And the impact to others (non-FCC) is a big factor. It is obvious that it is a WARC sized issue but the current band plan seems to have many hams in a tizzy.

Some starting points could be:  
AAdditional Digital Allocations  
Digital allocations for Nov/Tech  
Re-appraisal of the Huge phone sections and possible  
dig/sstv/fax allocations there  
A refinement of the current CW "plan"

thanks for the reply

73

-----

Date: 4 Oct 1994 17:17:49 GMT  
From: Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com

References<mitchr-2609941200340001@pacsci-20.pacsci.org>  
<367mij\$1pm@chnews.intel.com>, <Cx426v.72s@cscsun.rmc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <Cx426v.72s@cscsun.rmc.edu>,  
David Tiller <dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu> wrote:

>Doesn't the rule say "must be able to copy by ear?" I can send faster than  
>greased lightning, but I can't receive worth a darn. (See previous post).  
>I can send machine perfect at 20wpm (according to my pk232), but after 5 years  
>of fighting 13wpm, I'm at about 8.

Hi David, I haven't read the treaty but others on the newsgroup have said

that the treaty requires receiving by ear \_and\_ transmitting. The logic is, since they already ignore the treaty requirement for transmitting and only test for receiving, why can't they ignore receiving and only test for transmitting? Someone I know passed with a transmitting only test. Try finding a sympathetic examineer. A note from your doctor explaining your modem emulation disability might help convince the examineer to allow you to send to prove that you really know Morse code.

--

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

-----

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 1994 13:37:48 GMT

From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <100394195553Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject: Re: Get Over It

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings) writes:

>>>Then why is CW prevelant only on HF and not on VHF and above?

<Two of three good reasons deleted>

>>CW has historically been more prevelent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe  
>>this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other  
>>modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.

>So because they started in the stone age they should stay there? Not a  
>very good argument Jeff.

No no no, Dan; you're doing the same thing Todd did. Jim asked why CW is prevelent on HF and not on VHF and I listed 3 reasons. Don't try to read into what I said - just accept it on its face value. No pro-code argument was meant, only observations.

Jeff

-----

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 1994 13:45:03 GMT

From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<199410012203.PAA14529@ucsd.edu> <Cx1Ezx.MF2@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<100394200204Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject: Re: Glass houses and those who live in them

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>jeffrey@The.Big.Kahuna (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>Remember that the regulations *\*require\** that we run as little  
>>power as possible!

>Actually it requires "the minimum transmitter power necessary to  
>carry out the desired communications." It most certinally does NOT say  
>"as little power as possible!" They are very different, Jeff.

Sheesh!

Having said that, ``...as little power as possible'' was meant to  
paraphrase the word-for-word quote of the regs. Otherwise, running  
as little power as possible would mean 0 Watts output - ridiculous!

Jeff

-----  
Date: 5 Oct 1994 05:34:20 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<36bs5p\$39g@news.iastate.edu> <Cx2BMq.A96@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<100394174418Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

: >This idea that you have of  
: >the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for *\*outside\**  
: >the amateur service just does not occure. Our trained pool goes to  
: >work on the *\*ham bands\** during times of natural disasters. The  
: >only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during  
: >WWII.

: Jeff, you make a claim that the ARS is not to provide a pool of trained  
: operators, then you point out an example of grave national emergency where  
: the trained pool WAS called upon.

Dan, he said he only saw this happen once. Pretty rare, huh? You  
continue:

: The trained pool is to provide a service  
: to the nation in any manner that the nation needs. Time of war is  
: definatly one. Some people think that, with the new wonder weapons,  
: militia type training is not needed. The truth is that there may still be  
: situations where the nation will call upon the militia and the hams for  
: service to the nation. And as you yourself pointed out it has not been  
: that long ago that we were needed outside the ARS.

Seems that I have heard the same argument made for CW...that it \_may\_  
be needed in an emergency if the high-tech stuff doesn't cut it. That  
argument was lept upon as foolish by you guys...that "just because it  
\_may\_ happen isn't enough justification". Which is it?

: >Some military ops do become hams (the ham license is easy after  
: >the training they've received from the military), but the opposite  
: >is rare.

: That is not the point. The point is to have a pool ready when the  
: situation arises, to provide any service that may be needed. If the ARS  
: frequencies are sufficent (most of the time) then that is all tha is used.  
: If those systems are not appropriate, then the 'operators' move to the  
: areas that are (like WWII).

Ooooh, I love this line...sounds like a hearty endorsement for  
requiring CW proficiency! And from Dan, no less! Thanks Dan! :-)

: Dan N8PKV

Greg WB0RTK

-----  
Date: Wed, 5 Oct 1994 15:22:06 GMT  
From: dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller)

References<CwszG9.80E@news.Hawaii.Edu> <092894121443Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<36ckbh\$e5f@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:  
: In article <092894121443Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

: |> In part a trained pool of operators. And



: |> I reject the suggestion that "anyone" can just pick up a radio and  
: |> EFFECTIVELY communicate.

: So your definition of a trained pool of operators is "someone who knows  
: how to talk on the radio".

Not just talk, but communicate effectively, like during disaster relief -  
knowing when to talk and when to be quiet, not acting as a "net Cop" trying  
to help out, knowing what zero beat means so everyone is on the same freq,  
knowing how to tune up your rig \_off\_ the frequency and/or off the air  
entirely, knowing the proper protocol used to insure traffic flows fast and  
accurately, etc. Generally, having good operating practices and consideration  
for all others on the bands. By the way, effective communication is \_not\_  
limited to voice (phone) emissions...

--

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-3710	
dtiller@rmc.edu	n2kau/4	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew no	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N	
hearth companions."	Ashland, Va 23005		77d 31' 32.19" W

-----

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 1994 13:25:32 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<36bs5p\$39g@news.iastate.edu> <Cx2BMq.A96@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<100394174418Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>jeffrey@The.Big.Kahuna (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>In my experience as a government/military radio operator I encountered  
>>very few operators who were also hams. This idea that you have of  
>>the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for \*outside\*  
>>the amateur service just does not occure. Our trained pool goes to  
>>work on the \*ham bands\* during times of natural disasters. The  
>>only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during  
>>WWII.

>Jeff, you make a claim that the ARS is not to provide a pool of trained  
=====

I made an OBSERVATION not a claim, Dan.

>operators, then you point out an example of grave national emergency where  
>the trained pool WAS called upon. The trained pool is to provide a service  
>to the nation in any manner that the nation needs. Time of war is  
>definatly one. Some people think that, with the new wonder weapons,  
>militia type training is not needed. The truth is that there may still be  
>situations where the nation will call upon the militia and the hams for  
>service to the nation. And as you yourself pointed out it has not been  
>that long ago that we were needed outside the ARS.

The gap between what the military requires and what hams can provide  
has widened to the point that it is doubtful there will ever again  
be a widespread conscription.

Interestingly enough, I recall reading that amateur equipment  
was also conscripted during WWII; maybe someone can provide details.

The past regional conflicts, namely Korea, Viet Nam, and the police-  
actions of Grenada, Panama, and Haiti saw no need for the use of  
hams except to provide morale and H&W phone patches (on the ham  
bands).

On a day-to-day basis our pool provides service to ARES, RACES, CAP,  
MARS, NTS, and to sheriff/police/fire communication auxiliaries on  
(or, for MARS and CAP, close to) the ham bands.

Jeff

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #478

\*\*\*\*\*